

3-9-1988

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/09/1988

Sue Tirotta

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/09/1988" (1988). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 648.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/648>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Central Washington University

March 9, 1988

Residing Officer: Owen Pratz
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Alumbaugh, Brunner, Carr, Gierlasinski, Hasbrouck, Herum, Jefferies, Ressler and Sperry.
Visitors: Ken Harsha, Rosco Tolman, Wolfgang Franz, Don Schliesman, Dale Comstock and Carolyn Wells.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

-Move Budget Committee report to directly after President's report.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

*MOTION NO. 2613 Phil Backlund moved and Connie Roberts seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the February 24, 1988 meeting with the following changes:
-On page 2, under item 3 of the Budget Committee report: "The 4.5% was continued and a supplemental increase of 3.1% was added to it effective March 1, 1988 and extending through December 31, 1988; per Motion No. 2599 passed by the Senate..." should read "The 4.5% was continued and a supplemental increase of 3.1% was added to it effective March 1, 1988; per Motion No. 2599 passed by the Senate..."
-On page 2, under item 3 of the Budget Committee report: "This supplemental 3.1% salary increase will extend through December 31, 1988, whereupon a January 1, 1988 increase of 7.6% will become effective" should read "On January 1, 1989 an increase of 7.6% will become effective."
Motion passed.

COMMUNICATIONS

None

REPORTS

1. CHAIR

-Chair Pratz announced the following nominations for the 1988-89 Senate Executive Committee: Chair - Connie Roberts, BEAM; Vice Chair - Barry Donahue, Computer Science; Secretary - Stephen Jefferies, PEHLS; At-Large Member - Ken Gamon, Math; At-Large Member - Charles McGehee, Sociology. The Chair asked for additional nominations from the floor; there were none.

*MOTION NO. 2614 Beverly Heckart moved and Bill Vance seconded a motion that nominations for the 1988-89 Senate Executive Committee be closed. Motion passed.

*MOTION NO. 2615 Beverly Heckart moved and Bill Vance seconded a nomination to elect the entire slate of nominees for 1988-89 Senate Executive Committee as proposed:

CHAIR	-	Connie Roberts, BEAM
VICE CHAIR	-	Barry Donahue, Computer Science
SECRETARY	-	Stephen Jefferies, PEHLS
AT-LARGE MEMBER	-	Ken Gamon, Math
AT-LARGE MEMBER	-	Charles McGehee, Sociology

Motion passed.

-Chair Pratz noted as an item of information that, on the recommendation of Don Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Senate Executive Committee has approved a change in the structure of the Undergraduate Council to include the Director of Academic Advising as an ex-officio member. New membership = 6 faculty, 2 students, 2 ex-officio: Dean of Admissions and Records; Director of Academic Advising.

-Legislative Liaison Bob Benton reports that the Washington State Senate and House of Representatives have each drafted a bill concerning health care (Senate Bill SSB 5912; House (Budget) Bill EHB 1312). A number of items in both bills are similar, and both will result in some loss for state employees. The Senate bill will require additional premiums for a spouse and dependents and defines dependents more narrowly than the House bill, which simply uses the IRS definition. The House bill is a much more generous bill for state employees with families. The Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) recommends that concerned faculty use the Legislative Hot Line (1-800-562-6000) to call their local legislators (Senator "Tub" Hansen, Representative Glyn Chandler, Representative Curtis Smith) to support the House bill over the Senate bill; he noted that calls should be made by March 10, which is the last scheduled day of this legislative session.

2. PRESIDENT

Ed Harrington, Vice President for Academic Affairs, offered information concerning the State Senate's proposed \$155,000 budget cut for C.W.U. Dr. Harrington explained that a misconception regarding Central's summer school funding has resulted in the proposal to cut the \$155,000, which has already been committed in the area of accreditation for Central's School of Business and Economics. Dr. Harrington further explained the administration's efforts to have the monies included back into the budget, as additional faculty are already being hired for the School of Business and Economics and fund raising has produced substantial private contributions based on future accreditation of the Business School.

In February Vice President Harrington visited the Army training center at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. Dr. Harrington was favorably impressed with Ft. Jackson's program to attract women, minorities and low-income inductees by offering superior quality housing, food, medical services, specialized training and aid for future college expenses.

3. BUDGET COMMITTEE

Budget Committee Chair Phil Backlund asked that Chair Pratz allow MOTION NO. 2597 (tabled 12/2/87), under Old Business, to be moved to the first item of business under the Budget Committee's report; he explained that the Budget Committee would like to re-consider tabled Motion No. 2597 because it was passed by the Budget Committee, briefly considered by the Senate and deserves resolution. Since there was no objection from the Senate, Chair Pratz complied with this request and Phil Backlund removed it from the table for further discussion:

*TABLED MOTION NO. 2597: Phil Backlund moved that the Administration (President and Vice President for Academic Affairs) be asked to remove the barrier at step 34 of the salary scale to allow full professors to move up the salary scale through a combination of professional growth and merit.

(From December 2, 1987 Senate meeting minutes: "Phil Backlund reported the Budget Committee's belief that present salary policy appears to limit faculty movement to the top of the salary scale; the committee could find no evidence that any faculty member hired as an Assistant Professor in the past 20 years has attained the top of the salary scale through promotion, professional growth and/or merit during their tenure at C.W.U. Dr. Backlund stated that if the following motion were passed, President Garrity would not support it before the Board of Trustees.")

Senators expressed the opinion that teaching faculty should have a reasonable expectation of reaching the top of the salary scale; that although the philosophy behind merit is a good one, money for merit increases is not usually available on a regular basis; that professional growth percentage increases are not evenly distributed, as those at the top of the scale receive a larger dollar increase than those at the bottom of the scale; and that lower ranking faculty may overcome the professional growth ceilings by promotion but that the step 34 ceiling was arbitrarily created.

*SUBSTITUTE MOTION NO. 2597A Victor Marx moved and Beverly Heckart seconded a motion that the Administration (President and Vice President for Academic Affairs) be asked to raise the overlap ceiling by four (4) steps for each rank on the salary scale. Motion defeated (12 yes, 15 no).

Vote was held on MOTION NO. 2597. Motion defeated (8 yes, 18 no, 1 abstention).

*MOTION NO. 2616 Phil Backlund moved the Senate Budget Committee recommendation that the 7.6% salary increase due January 1, 1989 be distributed as follows: a one step professional growth increase to those eligible and recommended, with the remainder as an across the board scale adjustment.

Senate Budget Committee member Wolfgang Franz distributed a memo with salary comparison tables for 1970, 1981 and 1988 to support his recommendation that the entire 7.6% increase be used to adjust the salary scale. Senators also suggested dividing the amount of monies in the 7.6% increase by the number of faculty and increasing each scale step by an equal dollar amount; that merit be included as an important part of the distribution; and that the overlap ceilings for each rank be raised. Vice President Harrington informed the Senate that his office has been accumulating recent salary data and statistics; interested parties may contact him for more information.

3. BUDGET COMMITTEE, continued

*MOTION NO. 2617 Beverly Heckart moved and David Canzler seconded a motion to table Motion No. 2616 until the April 13, 1988 Faculty Senate meeting so that more information can be gathered and further discussion of the distribution can take place at the department level. Motion passed.

At the February 24, 1988 Senate meeting, Chair Pratz informed the Senate that Trustee Sterling Munro asked him how the merit system was perceived as working; Chair Pratz proposed that the Senate review the system and deliver a report to the Board of Trustees during the 1988-89 academic year.

*MOTION NO. 2618 Phil Backlund moved the Senate Budget Committee's recommendation that an Ad Hoc Committee be formed to study the Merit/Professional Growth faculty salary system at Central Washington University. The Committee should consist of the following members: two members of the Board of Trustees, one Academic Dean, the Senate Budget Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (ex-officio). The Budget Committee further recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee do a thorough review of salary increase systems in a wide range of peer institutions. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee would be presented to the Senate during Winter Quarter, 1989.

*SUBSTITUTE MOTION NO. 2618A Beverly Heckart moved and Jay Bachrach seconded a motion that the Senate Budget Committee meet together with the Administration and the Board of Trustees to study the Merit/Professional Growth faculty salary system at Central Washington University and report to the Senate during Winter quarter, 1989.
Motion passed. (SUBSTITUTE MOTION NO. 2618A replaces MOTION NO. 2618)

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

-Policy on "Grade Averaging:"

Academic Affairs Committee Chair Charles McGehee reported that the Committee discussed the Senate Executive Committee's charge regarding "grade averaging" and has concluded that there is a serious misunderstanding as to how the course repetition policy works. The Executive Committee's charge suggests that a repeated grade is averaged with an earlier grade and that that averaged grade is what appears on the student's transcript.

This is not correct. All grades appear on the transcript as they are earned; state law prohibits altering official documents, although additional material may be added. The only effect of retaking a class is on the GPA. It is recalculated as the result of retaking a class and includes the grade points of all classes taken. Nothing is deleted from the transcript and no grade is modified. The committee is therefore returning this charge for the Executive Committee's reconsideration.

-Student Class Attendance Policy:

Charles McGehee reported that the Undergraduate Council recommended a change in the class attendance policy because the change in registration procedures has made the previous policy ineffective (instructors could drop students from a course if they failed to attend a class meeting by 5:00 p.m. on the Monday after classes had begun).

*MOTION NO. 2619 Charles McGehee moved adoption of the following Student Class Attendance Policy: If a student fails to attend a class in which enrolled by the end of the third instructional day of the quarter, the course instructor may drop the student from the class roll and fill the space with another student. This policy will become effective Spring quarter, 1988. Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. Agenda material not covered at this meeting will be placed on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

* * * * * NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: April 13, 1988 * * * * *

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 9, 1988
SUB 204-205

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 24, 1988
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
- V. REPORTS
 1. Chair
 - Election of 1988-89 Senate Executive Committee:
Nominees:
Chair - Connie Roberts
Vice Chair - Barry Donahue
Secretary - Stephen Jefferies
At-Large - Ken Gamon
At-Large - Charles McGehee
 - Undergraduate Council structure (see attached motion)
 2. President
 3. Academic Affairs Committee
 - Grade Averaging (see attached)
 - Monitoring the Academic Plan (see attached)
 - Student Class Attendance Policy (see attached motion)
 - Drop Policy (see attached motion)
 - Withdrawal Policy (see attached motion)
 4. Budget Committee
 - 1/1/89 Salary Increase Disbursement (see attached motion)
 - Ad Hoc Committee to Study Merit/Professional Growth (see attached motion)
 5. Code Committee
 - NOTICE: Code Hearing, March 10, 1988; 3:00 p.m.;
SUB 207
 6. Curriculum Committee
 - UCC Page 896
 7. Personnel Committee
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
 - Tabled Budget Committee Motion #2597 (see attached)
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

* * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 13, 1988 * * *

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Recommended by Don Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, on behalf of the Undergraduate Council (2/24/88):

MOTION: The Senate Executive Committee recommends that the structure of the Undergraduate Council be revised to include the Director of Academic Advising as an ex-officio member.

(Current membership = 6 faculty, 2 students, 1 ex-officio: Dean of Admissions and Records)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

GRADE AVERAGING

Executive Committee's Charge to review the Policy on "Grade Averaging Policy:" The Academic Affairs Committee has discussed the above matter and has concluded that there is a serious misunderstanding as to how the course repetition policy works. The Executive Committee's charge suggests that a repeated grade is averaged with an earlier grade and that that averaged grade is what appears on the student's transcript.

This is not correct. All grades appear on the transcript as they are earned. The only effect of retaking a class is on the GPA. It is recalculated as the result of retaking a class and includes the grade points of all classes taken. Nothing is deleted from the transcript and no grade is modified.

The committee is therefore returning this charge for the Executive Committee's reconsideration.

MONITORING THE ACADEMIC PLAN

Executive Committee's Charge to monitor the "Academic Plan:" The Academic Affairs Committee has considered the charge and has concluded that it is beyond the scope of the committee. Since the committee's primary function is policy, it has neither the time nor expertise to act as a monitor of something as complex as the Academic Plan.

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Executive Committee create either a standing committee or an Ad Hoc Committee which has as its sole task the monitoring of the Academic Plan.

STUDENT CLASS ATTENDANCE POLICY

- MOTION:
1. If a student fails to attend a class in which enrolled by the end of the third instructional day of the quarter, the course instructor may drop the student from the class role and fill the space with another student.
 2. This policy will become effective Spring 1988.

DROP POLICY

In response to the Senate Executive Committee's charge of September 30, 1987, the Academic Affairs Committee submits the following recommendation for the Faculty Senate's action.

- MOTION:
1. Each student will be permitted to drop two (2) courses during the first five days of instruction (add-drop period) without fee. A fee of \$10 will be assessed for each additional course dropped during this period.
 2. This policy should be implemented Fall quarter, 1989.

(continued)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued

WITHDRAWAL POLICY

MOTION:

1. A limited number of uncontested (peremptory) withdrawals from individual courses will be permitted from the sixth day of instruction through the end of the sixth week of instruction according to the following schedule:

No. of credits earned at time of course withdrawal.	No. of uncontested withdrawals permitted.
0 - 44	2
45 - 89	1
90 - 134	1
135 - 179	1
180 - 224	1
etc.	1
2. Transfer credits will not be included in the calculation for eligibility for uncontested withdrawal.
3. One uncontested withdrawal will be permitted for each 45 credits after 180 credits including postbaccalaureate, special, fifth-year, and non-degree, non-matriculated graduate students. Withdrawals for degree-seeking, matriculated graduate students will be governed by rules established by the Graduate School and are not governed by this policy.
4. Such peremptory withdrawals will be noted on the student's transcript with "**W". Unused withdrawal allocations will not be cumulative.
5. The Registrar will establish criteria for withdrawing from summer session courses, workshops and other summer credit generating experiences of differing length in keeping with the principles established herein for the regular academic year.
6. Withdrawals after the sixth week of instruction or when the allotted peremptory withdrawals have been used, will be granted only for reasons of hardship and then only upon written petition to and written approval by the Dean of Admissions and Records. The student must have discussed the reasons for the withdrawal with the affected faculty member and the Dean must consult with affected faculty when evaluating a petition.
7. Approved hardship withdrawals will be noted on the student's transcript with a "HW" (hardship withdrawal).
8. No withdrawals from individual courses may be made after the last day of classroom instruction (i.e., no withdrawals will be permitted during or after the final examination period.)
9. Conversions of Incompletes to withdrawals will be treated as hardship withdrawals, i.e., they may be effected only upon petition to the Dean of Admissions and Records.
10. No withdrawals of any kind will be calculated into the student's grade average.
11. A student may withdraw from the university for reasons of illness or other extenuating circumstances at any time upon written petition to and written permission from the Dean of Admissions and Records.
12. Approved withdrawals from the university will be noted on the student's transcript with "W".
13. No fee of any kind will be assessed for withdrawing from a course after the fifth day of class (add-drop period).
14. The Registrar will notify affected faculty members promptly when a student has withdrawn from a class regardless of the reason.
15. This policy should be implemented Fall quarter, 1989.

(continued)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, continued
WITHDRAWAL POLICY, continued

RATIONALE: The fundamental differences between these proposals and the previous one are as follows:

1. Drop and Withdrawal Policies have been separated to minimize confusion.
2. A fee of \$10 has been proposed for any drops over two within a given add-drop period. This means that a student has two "free" drops. The committee was concerned not to punish innocent students so as to deal with those abusing the system, and especially not to force students to pay a fee for system generated drops, i.e., drops made necessary by holding alternative class enrollments open while waiting for slots to open in closed but required classes or because of the necessity to show enrollment for 12 credits to qualify for financial aid when required courses are not yet available. The student government believed that all "legitimate" drops could be accomplished within this restriction.

Since the point of the fee from the outset has been to reduce the number of drops, this modification, and the separation of the drop from the withdrawal policy means that students withdrawing normally will also not be subject to a fee.

3. Transfer credits will not be counted in determining the number of uncontested withdrawals permitted. Only credits generated at CWU will be considered. This is because transfer credits frequently are not known at the outset, and hence unusable as a criterion for withdrawal. The only effect of this change would be to increase the number of uncontested withdrawals a transfer student may use.
4. The number of uncontested withdrawals permitted for a student with 0-44 credits has been reduced to two. The reason for this is that, since it is now being recommended that transfer credits not be used in calculating eligibility for uncontested withdrawals, transfer students will be eligible for the same number of withdrawals as a freshman. Freshman statistically do not use withdrawals as much as transfer students, and the committee felt that three uncontested withdrawals for transfers would be too much. One would have been too few for freshmen. Two was a compromise which was made somewhat more defensible due to possible poor preparation by transfer students.
5. The cut-off time for uncontested withdrawals has been raised to six weeks. This was a concession to reality. Besides, as was pointed out in Senate debate, the limitation on the number of uncontested withdrawals effectively minimized abuses.
6. Graduate students have been removed from the policy altogether with responsibility for withdrawal policy being given to the Graduate School. Since graduate students are a highly select and motivated group and are under the direct supervision of the Graduate School any way, the committee did not regard them as a problem.
7. Provision has been included for prompt notification of faculty by the Registrar of any withdrawals from class.
8. An implementation date of Fall, 1989, has been proposed to allow sufficient time for planning and preparation by the Registrar as well as to coincide with the new catalogue.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

MOTION: The Senate Budget Committee recommends that the 7.6% salary increase due January 1, 1989 be distributed as follows: a one step professional growth increase to those eligible and recommended with the remainder as an across the board scale adjustment.

MOTION: The Senate Budget Committee recommends that an Ad Hoc Committee be formed to study the Merit/Professional Growth faculty salary system at Central Washington University. The Committee should consist of the following members: one member of the Board of Trustees, one Academic Dean and the Senate Budget Committee. The Budget Committee further recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee do a thorough review of salary increase systems in a wide range of peer institutions. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee would be presented to the Senate during Winter Quarter, 1989.

OLD BUSINESS

TABLED MOTION NO. 2597:

From December 2, 1987 Senate meeting minutes: "Phil Backlund reported the Budget Committee's belief that present salary policy appears to limit faculty movement to the top of the salary scale; the committee could find no evidence that any faculty member hired as an Assistant Professor in the past 20 years has attained the top of the salary scale through promotion, professional growth and/or merit during their tenure at CWU. Dr. Backlund stated that if the following motion were passed, President Garrity would not support it before the Board of Trustees."

The Budget Committee would like to re-consider tabled Motion No. 2597 because it was passed by the Committee, briefly considered by the Senate and deserves resolution:

TABLED MOTION NO. 2597: Phil Backlund moved that the Administration (President and Vice President for Academic Affairs) be asked to remove the barrier at step 34 of the salary scale to allow full professors to move up the salary scale through a combination of professional growth and merit.

☒ John AGARS
☐ Richard ALUMBAUGH
☒ Jay BACHRACH
☒ Phil BACKLUND
☒ Ethan BERGMAN
☐ Jerry BRUNNER
☒ Larry BUNDY
☒ David CANZLER
☒ Frank CARLSON
☐ John CARR
☒ Ed DIXON
☒ Barry DONAHUE
☒ Ken GAMON
☒ Donald GARRITY
☐ Norm GIERLASINSKI
☐ Richard HASBROUCK
☒ A. James HAWKINS
☒ Beverly HECKART
☐ John HERUM
☒ James HINTHORNE
☐ Stephen JEFFERIES
☒ George KESLING
☐ Nancy LESTER
☒ Mike LITTLE
☒ Richard MACK
☒ Linda MARRA
☒ Victor MARX
☒ Charles McGEHEE
☐ Michael PAULOS
☒ Owen PRATZ
☐ John RESSLER
☒ Connie ROBERTS
☒ Mark SHRINER
☐ Arne SIPPOLA
☐ Willard SPERRY
☒ Bill VANCE
☒ Randall WALLACE
☒ Rex WIRTH
☒ Don WISE
☒ Tom YEH

☐ Gary GALBRAITH
☐ Susan LONBORG
☐ Peter BURKHOLDER
☐ Roger GARRETT
☐ David GEE
☐ G.W. BEED
☐ Ed GOLDEN
☐ Cal GREATSINGER
☐ William BARKER
☐ Hal OTT
☐ Bernard MARTIN
☐ Barney ERICKSON
☒ Ed HARRINGTON
☐ Dick WASSON
☐ Walter EMKEN
☐ Randolph WISCHMEIER
☐ Larry LOWTHER
☐ Don RINGE
☐ Scott RICARDO
☐ Allen GULEZIAN
☒ Kelton KNIGHT
☐ R.J. CARBAUGH
☐ Wendy RICHARDS
☐ Patrick MCLAUGHLIN
☐ Frank SESSIONS
☒
☐ Otto JAKUBEK
☐ Ken HARSHA
☒ Minerva CAPLES
☐ Robert BENNETT
☐ Karl Cloninger
☐ William FLOYD
☐ Jim BROWN
☐ Wells McINELLY
☐ William SCHMIDT

Please sign your name and return
this sheet to the Faculty Senate Secretary
directly after the meeting. Thank you.

March 9, 1988

DATE

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Ken Hanka

Rosco Tolman

Don Schliesman

Dale Comstock

Carolyn Wells



MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate Budget Committee

FROM: Wolfgang Franz, Economics Department

DATE: March 7, 1988

RE: Loss of purchasing power of faculty salaries between Fall 1970 and Summer 1988 and Fall 1981 and Summer 1988

The two attached tables give actual salaries for 1970, 1981 and 1988, inflated 1970 and 1981 earnings to 1988 values, and the percent loss of purchasing over the respective periods. The starting figures used are the lowest salary step for each of the three ranks and an assortment of other steps.

Discussion of Table I

The first three rows in Table I show the salaries and loss of purchasing power for persons hired in the lowest step for each rank in the Fall of 1970 and in the Summer of 1988.

To give an example of how the figures should be read, according to Table I, an assistant professor who started in step 4 in the Fall of 1970 received at that time a salary of \$8,860. Since the step schedule was changed in 1981, actual earnings at the starting step at that rank in the Fall of 1988 were \$19,442. Adjusting the 1970 earnings of \$8,860 for inflation by the U.S. Consumer Price Index (CPI) gives a 1988 dollar equivalent of \$26,890. This figure compared with actual 1988 earnings of \$19,442 shows a loss of \$9,840 or 28.3%.

Four additional steps are listed for comparisons in Table I, the lowest step, one-third and two-thirds up the 1970 schedule and the highest step. As indicated in the last column of Table I, the loss of purchasing power for the lowest one-third and two-thirds steps ranged between 31% and 34.2%, while the highest step lost 20.2%. The reasons for this lower loss is since seven additional steps were added when the new salary schedule was designed in 1981.

Again, to give an example, assume that a person was hired two-thirds up the scale at step 16 in the Fall of 1970. Assume further that he/she has not

received any professional growth, merit or promotion steps since. That person would have lost 33.4% of its purchasing power. Though this assumption is unrealistic, it nevertheless traces the adjustments in the scale of the past 18 years.

Discussion of Table II

Table II lists 1981 salaries for various ranks and steps and inflates them to 1988 equivalents. It then compares them to 1988 actual values. As indicated in the last column of Table II, each step lags an identical 7.8% behind the 1981 schedule.

Recommendations

In light of the findings that the purchasing power of our salary schedule has been shrinking, it is recommended that the total amount of money available for salary increases now should be used to adjust the scale. This adjustment would amount to about 7.6% and would thus approximately restore the purchasing power of the 1981 schedule. Though we still would be greatly lagging behind the purchasing power of the 1970 schedule, we would at least restore the integrity of the 1981 schedule which was totally redesigned in 1981. The timing for such action may be especially appropriate now since professional growth and merit increases were just granted March 1, 1988.

It is fully understandable that there may be a sentiment to allocate a substantial amount toward professional growth. However, one needs to be aware of at least three consequences. First, people in the overlap will not receive it. Second, it moves others farther toward the overlap. Third and perhaps most importantly, it would further lower the ceiling of the salary schedule for each rank in terms of actual purchasing power. Thus, I recommend that the full 7.6% would be used to adjust the salary schedule.

TABLE I

Comparison of purchasing power of CWU Faculty at same step and at lowest step for each rank from Fall 1970 to Summer 1988.

Step or Rank	Fall 1970 old step	Fall 1970 Salary	1988 Equivalent Step	Actual March 88 Salary	1970 Salary in 1988 \$	% Loss
Assistant Professor	4	8,860	9	19,442	26,890	27.7
Associate Professor	10	11,460	17	24,941	34,781	28.3
Full Professor	16	14,312	23	29,752	43,436	31.5
Lowest Step	.5	7,507	1	14,987	22,783	34.2
One-Third	8	10,537	13	22,074	31,979	31.0
Two-Thirds	16	14,312	22	28,915	43,436	33.4
Highest	24	16,648	40	47,577	59,631	20.2

Deflator used

CPI, U.S. 1967 = 100, 1970 = 116.3, 1988 = 353

TABLE II

Comparison of purchasing power of CWU Faculty at same step and lowest step for each rank from Fall 1970 to Summer 1988.

Step or Rank	Salary Step 1981 and 1988	Fall 1981 Salary	Actual March 88 Salary	1981 Salary in 1988 \$	% Loss
Assistant Professor	9	16,279	19,442	21,097	7.8
Associate Professor	17	20,884	24,941	27,065	7.8
Full Professor	23	24,913	29,752	32,287	7.8
Lowest step	1	12,549	14,987	16,203	7.8
Highest step	40	39,837	47,577	51,628	7.8

Deflator used

CPI, U.S. 1967 = 100, 1981 = 272.4, 1988 = 353